

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration and allowance of the above-identified application is respectfully requested in view of the present Amendment. The Official Action, mailed June 28, 2004, has been carefully reviewed. By this Amendment, claims 1 and 5 have been amended.

The Examiner has rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by the Hurley, et. al. reference (U.S. Patent No. 3,771,788). It is respectfully submitted that a review of this reference reveals that it does not anticipate, disclose, suggest or make obvious the Applicant's invention. The Applicant's invention involves a golf putter head having a cylindrical configuration in cross-section and having a central portion which terminates in oppositely disposed end portions. The central portion and the oppositely disposed end portions each have a substantially constant diameter along the longitudinal axis of the golf putter head. The oppositely disposed end portions are of the same diameter. In contrast, the Hurley, et. al. reference discloses a putt-cue device with two different sized striking heads. In addition, the central portion of cue head does not have a substantially constant diameter along the longitudinal axis of the cue head, as in the Applicant's invention. Furthermore, the oppositely disposed striking heads do not have a substantially constant diameter along the longitudinal axis of the cue head, as in the Applicant's invention. In fact, the oppositely disposed striking heads actually increase in diameter along the longitudinal axis of the cue head. In view of the foregoing structural differences between the Applicant's invention and the putt-cue device disclosed in this reference, it is

respectfully submitted that the Applicant's invention is not anticipated by this reference, and is patentable thereover.

Claim 1 has also been rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by the Mullins reference (U.S. Patent No. 4,881,737). It is respectfully submitted that a review of this reference reveals that it does not anticipate, disclose, suggest or make obvious the Applicant's invention. This reference discloses a golf putter head, however, the putter head disclosed in this reference does not have oppositely disposed end portions with a substantially constant diameter along the longitudinal axis of the putter head. In fact, the ends 34 "are convexly rounded in directions extending longitudinally of the head" (column 2, lines 54-55). In view of this structural difference between the Applicant's invention and the putter head disclosed in this reference, it is respectfully submitted that the Applicant's invention is not anticipated by this reference, and is patentable thereover.

The Examiner has also rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by the Holdstein reference (U.S. Patent No. D188,678). Here again, it is respectfully submitted that a review of this reference reveals that it does not anticipate, disclose, suggest or make obvious the Applicant's invention. The Holdstein reference discloses a croquet mallet wherein the mallet head has oppositely disposed end portions, each being comprised of a multiplicity of concentric different diameters rather than having a constant diameter along the longitudinal axis of the mallet head. In view of this structural difference between the Applicant's invention and the croquet mallet head disclosed in this reference, it is respectfully submitted that the Applicant's invention is not anticipated by this reference, and is patentable thereover.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the Applicant's invention is not anticipated by any of the aforementioned references, and is patentable thereover. However, in order to more specifically define the Applicant's invention, independent claim 1 has been amended to include the limitation that the central portion and the oppositely disposed end portions of the body portion each have a substantially constant diameter along the longitudinal axis of the putter head. In view of this amendment of independent claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that this claim, and all claims dependent thereon, are now in condition for allowance.

Claims 2-6 have been rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Mullins reference (U.S. Patent No. 4,881,737) in view of the Drake reference (U.S. Patent No. 4,508,342). Considering the structural differences previously set forth between the Applicant's invention and the putter head disclosed in the Mullins reference, and in view of the limitations introduced into independent claim 1 by this Amendment, it is respectfully submitted that claims 2-6, which depend on claim 1, are in condition for allowance.

Claim 5 has been amended to more specifically define the oppositely disposed end portions of the golf putter head of the Applicant's invention and to ensure that the proper antecedent basis exists for same in this claim.

In view of this Amendment, it is respectfully submitted the above-identified application is in condition for allowance, and such action is requested.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Hudak, Reg. No. 27,340
Attorney for Applicant
29425 Chagrin Blvd., Suite #304
Cleveland, Ohio 44122-4602
(216) 292-3900

Date: September 24, 2004